18th October 1927]

(*f*) The Taluk Board maintains four daily and eight weekly markets, the expenditure thereon in 1925-26 being Rs. 165 against an income of Rs. 3,117. There is no information as to how many of these markets are within the Udipi town. The Taluk Board maintains one hospital at Udipi which is treated as a Taluk Headquarter Institution the pay of the Civil Assistant Surgeon employed in it being met by the Government. It maintains three rural dispensaries at a cost of Rs. 360 a year on account of each dispensary. The total expenditure incurred by the Board on Medical relief during 1925-26 was Rs. 10,637. None of the rural dispensaries is within the Udipi town.

(*g*) The Taluk Board maintained 87 elementary schools during the year 1925-26. There is no information as to how many of them were within the Udipi town. Taluk Boards cannot maintain any but elementary schools.

(*h*) Not understood.

(*i*) The population of Udipi town is 11,882. The population of the rest of the taluk is 198,027. There is no proposal to make Udipi a municipality.

(*j*) The hon. Member's attention is invited to the answer to clause (*a*) of question No. 204.

Alleged irregularities in the administration of the Cannanore Municipality.

*546 *Q.*—Mr. J. A. Saldanha: With reference to my question No. 18 answered on the 24th January 1927, will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased—

(*a*) to state whether in his judgment in the defamation case brought by the Chairman of the Cannanore Municipality against Churia Gopalan and two others, the Subdivisional Magistrate of Cannanore, Mr. V. R. Anantarama Ayyar, has referred to various irregularities in the administration of the municipality, to the increase in the number of suits filed by or against the municipality and to the failure of the municipality in most of such suits;

(*b*) to place before the Council a statement showing—

(i) the number and nature of the civil suits and criminal complaints instituted by and against the Cannanore Municipal Council during the five years ending with 31st March 1926 and the five previous years,

(ii) the appeals and second appeals against the orders and decrees of the Courts passed thereon, and their results,

(iii) the cost thrown on the municipal council thereby; and

(*c*) to state whether Government have decided or propose to surcharge the Chairman and members of the Municipal Council of Cannanore responsible for any wilfully wasteful expenditure on litigation, and what other action they have taken or propose to take against them?

A.—(*a*) The Government have not seen the judgment.

(*b*) They see no reason to do so.

(*c*) The question of surcharge is one for the consideration of the Auditor during audit.